DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 440 469 EA 030 385

AUTHOR	Lashway, Larry
TITLE	Accountability.
INSTITUTION	National Association of Elementary School Principals, Alexandria, VA.; ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, Eugene, OR.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	1999-00-00
NOTE	5p.
CONTRACT	ED-99-CO-0011
AVAILABLE FROM	National Association of Elementary School Principals, 1615 Duke Street, Alexandria, VA 22314-3483 ($2.50 prepaid; quantity discounts).
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Serials (022) -- ERIC Publications (071)
JOURNAL CIT	Research Roundup; v16 n1 Fall 1999
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Accountability; Elementary Secondary Education; Evaluation Criteria; *Improvement Programs; *Principals; *School Effectiveness

ABSTRACT

This issue reviews publications that provide a starting point for principals looking for a way through the accountability maze. Each publication views accountability differently, but collectively these readings argue that even in an era of state-mandated assessment, principals can pursue proactive strategies that serve students' needs. James A. Watts, Gale F. Gaines, and Joseph D. Creech's "Getting Results: A Fresh Look at School Accountability" describes the nature of comprehensive accountability systems. Charles Abelmann and Richard Elmore's "When Accountability Knocks, Will Anyone Answer?" shows that schools have internal accountability systems that influence the success of externally imposed standards. Karen Levesque, Denise Bradby, Kristi Rossi, and Peter Teitelbaum's "At Your Fingertips: Using Everyday Data to Improve Schools" provides school leaders with a guide to using school data to help chart the improvement process. Mack McCary, Joe Peel, and Wendy McColskey's "Using Accountability as a Lever for Changing the Culture of Schools: Examining District Strategies" describes the efforts of one district to develop a "culture of accountability" throughout the system. Robin J. Lake, Paul T. Hill, Lauren O'Toole, and Mary Beth Celio's "Making Standards Work: Active Voices, Focused Learning" examines the strategies used by Washington State schools to respond to state assessments. (DFR)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

EA 030385

ED 440 469

Research roundup

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

VOLUME 16, NUMBER 1
FALL 1999

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Accountability

Larry Lashway

Principals are no strangers to accountability; whenever a problem occurs in a school, heads automatically turn toward the office. However, the recent emphasis on high-stakes, standards-driven accountability systems poses a new set of problems for school leaders.

The new accountability assumes that systematic assessment of school performance on the basis of clearly identified standards will lead to school improvement. People who know the expectations tend to live up to them, especially when results are linked to consequences. Unlike the days when annual test scores were simply archived, accountability emphasizes public disclosure and possible sanctions, including the closing of nonperforming schools.

Although principals are more than willing to take responsibility for what happens in their schools, the current accountability movement presents some special challenges:

- Mobilizing human and fiscal resources to reach standards that are not just higher but more sophisticated;
- Avoiding unintended side effects, such as the tendency of assessment to drive non-tested content out of the curriculum;
- Managing public perceptions when test scores are published with little explanatory context;
- Maintaining teacher morale in schools identified as low-achieving; and
- Ensuring equity for students with special needs or from disadvantaged backgrounds.

The answers are far from clear, but the following readings provide a useful starting point for principals looking for a way through the accountability maze. Each views accountability through a slightly different lens, but collectively these readings argue that even in an era of state-mandated assessment, principals can pursue proactive strategies that will serve the needs of their students.

James A. Watts and colleagues describe the nature of comprehensive accountability systems.

Charles Abelmann and colleagues show that schools have internal accountability systems that influence the success of externally imposed standards.

Karen Levesque and colleagues provide school leaders with a guide to using school data to help chart the improvement process.

Mack McCary and colleagues describe the efforts of one district to develop a "culture of accountability" throughout the system.

Robin Lake and colleagues examine the strategies used by Washington State schools to respond to state assessments.

Watts, James A.; Gaines, Gale F.; and Creech, Joseph D. **Getting Results: A Fresh Look at School Accountability.** Atlanta, Ga.: Southern Regional Education Board, 1998. 27 pages. *Available from:* Southern Regional Education Board, 404-875-9211, ext.236. $5.00 plus shipping and handling. Web site: **www.sreb.org.**

Advocates of accountability often see it as a simple matter of testing results. But as the authors point out, effective accountability is a system that links standards, test-

Larry Lashway is a research analyst and writer for the ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management at the University of Oregon.

EA 030385

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ing, professional development, reporting, and consequences. Without careful alignment of the component parts, testing alone will have little effect.

The heart of the system is a set of clear content standards that point the way for students, teachers, and policy-makers. These standards should be developed with stakeholder input and should be understandable, rigorous, reasonable, well-focused, and measurable. Tests must be directly aligned to these standards; be reliable, valid, and fair; have a clear purpose; be operationally feasible; and be useful for school improvement by showing each school how its students are performing and where its instructional strengths and weaknesses are.

While accountability can be mandated at the state level, improvement can only occur in schools, which must have the capacity to make the necessary improvements. Thus, effective accountability requires a well-coordinated professional development program that is keyed to the standards and assessment, focused on student achievement, responsive to school needs, accessible for teachers—and well funded.

Another component is the process of informing the public of a school's progress. Effective progress reports focus on student learning, reveal trends, and communicate with a variety of audiences. A good report shows schools where they are, where they need to go, and what strengths and weaknesses they bring to the task.

Finally, accountability requires a bottom line, with rewards, sanctions, and assistance triggered by results. Highly controversial, rewards and sanctions require careful attention for fairness, consistency, and equity. For example, accountability systems should recognize improvement as well as attainment; otherwise schools that find themselves in a deep academic hole may be too discouraged to make the effort.

Abelmann, Charles; and Elmore, Richard; with Johanna Even, Susan Kenyon, and Joanne Marshall. **When Accountability Knocks, Will Anyone Answer?** RR-042. Philadelphia: Consortium for Policy Research in Education, 1999. 51 pages. *Available from:* CPRE, Graduate School of Education, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA 19104. 215-573-0700. $10.00 (includes shipping and handling). Send check payable to CPRE. Web site: **www.upenn.edu/gse/cpre**

The current accountability movement assumes that without external pressure schools would evade accountability. Charles Abelmann and colleagues challenge this assumption, arguing that schools have internal standards of accountability that influence the way they respond to state-imposed standards.

The authors conducted case studies in a diverse sample of 20 public, private, and charter schools. They found that these schools had preexisting standards of accountability that took three forms. First, individual teachers showed a personal sense of responsibility, with strong beliefs about what level of work to expect from students, what kinds of assignments are appropriate, and what students should be learning. These beliefs were based on personal values and often differed from teacher to teacher within the same school.

Second, teachers in a school sometimes developed shared expectations by working together on schoolwide issues. Some schools, for instance, had achieved consensus on what constituted an acceptable reading level for first graders, what level of corridor noise was acceptable, or how much homework should be assigned.

Finally, some schools had formal accountability mechanisms, such as teachers submitting weekly lesson plans, adhering to common disciplinary procedures, or following established curriculum guides.

The authors note that the strength of the internal accountability system affects the response to externally imposed measures. Schools with weak internal accountability will respond idiosyncratically and erratically to mandated external accountability. Schools with strong internal systems will accept outside standards when they are consistent with existing values, resist them when they are not, or simply adopt whatever imposed standards are consistent with their own and ignore the rest.

Because their sampled schools did not operate in a strong external accountability environment, the authors are cautious about generalizing their findings. But they conclude that schools with weak internal systems view external accountability like the weather—something that will affect them, "but not something they could or should do anything about."

Levesque, Karen; Bradby, Denise; Rossi, Kristi; and Teitelbaum, Peter. **At Your Fingertips: Using Everyday Data to Improve Schools.** Published jointly by MPR Associates, National Center for Research in Vocational Education, and American Association of School Administrators, 1998. 208 pages plus 64 worksheets. Item 269-001. *Available from:* AASA Distribution Center, P.O. Box 411, Annapolis Junction, MD 20701-0411. $39.95 (AASA members: $34.95). 888-782-2272. Web site: **www.aasa.org**

Meeting the new standards requires sophisticated leadership to maintain a steady focus on improvement while still satisfying the relentless everyday demands of constituents. Karen Levesque and

colleagues suggest that developing a set of "vital indicators" can serve as a reliable compass.

Schools typically generate reams of data for routine reports to state agencies. But instead of filing and forgetting this information, schools can use it to maintain control over their reform efforts rather than being totally driven by external tests. The authors outline a six-step process that begins with the identification of priority goals that may reflect national, state, or local concerns.

Because system goals are often stated broadly, a second step is needed to sharpen expectations. The most important outcomes focus on student learning, but tracking inputs (the resources available) and school practices (such as curriculum and assessment procedures) can help identify reasons for the school's success or failure.

The third step identifies existing data sources that may serve as useful indicators, including information obtained through questionnaires, teacher logs, focus groups with stakeholders, and classroom observations. However, raw data alone are of limited use. Leaders must sort through a variety of complex issues, such as who, what, and when to measure.

The fourth step, examination of the data, requires thoughtful analysis and interpretation. For example, a daily attendance rate of 92 percent may seemingly be equivalent to a grade of A, but it also represents more than three weeks of missed classes. Such an overall percentage may disguise significant variations; perhaps attendance is much lower on Fridays than the rest of the week, or perhaps absenteeism is significantly higher for sixth graders than for second graders.

With the necessary information in hand, schools can set performance targets by focusing on three key questions. Two of them, "How are we currently performing?" and "What do you want to reach for?" can be answered by matching local results against state and national standards, exemplary schools, and stakeholder expectations. The third question, "How do we get there?" is answered by identifying strategies that are likely to move the program in the desired direction.

Finally, to make improvement a continuing process rather than a one-time event, the first five steps have to be institutionalized into a recurrent cycle of goal-setting and data evaluation.

McCary, Mack; Peel, Joe; and McColskey, Wendy. **Using Accountability as a Lever for Changing the Culture of Schools: Examining District Strategies.** Greensboro, N.C.: SouthEastern Regional Vision for Education, 1997. 69 pages. ED 408 697. *Available from:* SERVE, 345 South Magnolia Drive, Suite D-23, Tallahassee, FL 32301. Item RDUAL. $8.00 plus $2.50 shipping and handling. 919-334-3211. Web site: **www.serve.org**

Pressure for results can lead schools to an almost obsessive focus on test scores. In this report, Mack McCary and colleagues advocate an alternative bottom-up approach that weaves accountability into the entire school culture.

The authors start from the premise that an excessive emphasis on testing can lead to low teacher morale, a narrowed curricular focus, a diminished sense of professionalism among teachers, and unethical placement practices. By contrast, accountability can be viewed in terms of Total Quality Management—everything a school does to ensure continual improvement and quality. Here the goal is steady progress rather than a single-minded focus on the bottom line.

The authors' North Carolina district built a "culture of quality" with several years of intensive effort. The starting point was developing meaningful indicators that went beyond test scores and reflected the school's educational vision. Included in their 42 new indicators were data such as entrance requirements for different grade levels, dropout rates, student participation in community-service projects, involvement of parent and community volunteers, the number of student books read at home, and faculty involvement in extracurricular activities. District personnel took an active lead in identifying the new indicators and building commitment to making them a daily part of institutional life.

The authors emphasize that achieving a culture of accountability does not happen overnight. Their efforts required active engagement with the entire school community and a capacity for listening and responding to staff concerns. They found no simple recipes, but relentless effort led to progress.

Lake, Robin J.; Hill, Paul T.; O'Toole, Lauren; and Celio, Mary Beth. **Making Standards Work: Active Voices, Focused Learning.** Seattle: Center on Reinventing Public Education, 1999. 206-616-5769. *Download for free at:* **www.gspa.washington/edu/crpe/crpehome.html**

Accountability systems ostensibly offer incentives that will spur schools to improve instruction. Some schools do improve, others do not. What accounts for the difference?

Robin Lake and colleagues explored this question in their study of 40 Washington State schools, 30 of which had significantly raised scores on a new fourth-grade assessment. They interviewed principals to find out how their schools had responded to the initial assessment.

The authors found that significant improvement came when schools took a proactive approach—

assessing their strengths and weaknesses, focusing on key priorities, and seeking help when they needed it. In particular, they found that effective improvement efforts are focused and schoolwide, going beyond tinkering with new textbooks or adding small course modules; often, this involved making major philosophical shifts. Teachers in improving schools tended to function as teams, not as individuals, and their schools were more likely to align professional development activities with improvement goals. Improving schools also actively sought assistance, taking the attitude, "Don't wait for help. Go out and find it."

Improving schools focused all available resources on key instructional goals. They were also more likely to involve parents in the process. It was also apparent that improving schools were responding as the accountability system predicted: stimulated by professional pride or community pressure, they felt compelled to do better on future assessments.

The authors note that their study was too limited to generate an overall prescription for improvement. There may have been schools that adopted the same strategies as the improving schools, but were unsuccessful. None of the sampled schools brought all their students up to state standards. Nonetheless, the study suggests that principals can respond positively to assessment results by identifying performance deficiencies, involving the whole school in a focused improvement strategy, aligning resources to support their goals, and seeking outside help when necessary. □

About ERIC

The Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) is a national information system operated by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI). The ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, one of 16 such units in the system, was established at the University of Oregon in 1966.

This publication was prepared by the Clearinghouse with funding from OERI, U.S. Department of Education, under contract no. ED-99-CO-0011. No federal funds were used in the printing.

ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, 5207 University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon 97403-5207. Phone 800-438-8841.
Web site: http://eric.uoregon.edu

Research Roundup is published three times during the school year by the National Association of Elementary School Principals. Single copies: $2.50; bulk orders (10 or more): $2.00 ea. Virginia residents add 4.5% sales tax. Specify date and title of issue when ordering. Checks payable to NAESP must accompany order. Send to National Principals Resource Center, 1615 Duke Street, Alexandria, Virginia 22314-3483.

The Schools Our Children Deserve

Alfie Kohn

In this landmark book, former teacher Alfie Kohn shows how shrill calls for tougher standards are squeezing the intellectual life out of our classrooms and offers a fresh perspective on our most basic assumptions about education.

Item #SOCD-RR1099
$24 members; $29.95 nonmembers (add $4.50 shipping and handling)

Best Classroom Practices: What Award-Winning Elementary Teachers Do

Randi Stone

Tap into this instant network of projects, ideas, and helpful tips from outstanding teachers, whose practices range from traditional to constructivist and from discipline-specific to interdisciplinary instruction.

Item #BCP-RR1099
$22.95 members; $27.95 nonmembers (add $4.50 shipping and handling)

To order, call the National Principals Resource Center at 800-38-NAESP (386-2377), fax 800-39-NAESP (396-2377), or send check or purchase order to:

National Principals Resource Center
1615 Duke Street, Alexandria, VA 22314-3483